

REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 13, 25 and 26 under U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and rejects claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,768,510 to Gish (hereinafter “Gish”).

In this response, Applicants amend the independent claims and respectfully traverse the §112, second paragraph, and the §102(b) rejection of claims 1-26.

Regarding the §112, second paragraph, Applicants have amended the independent claims to remove what the Examiner feels is improper antecedent basis. While Applicants considered the previous claims to be clear, Applicants have nonetheless attempted to clarify the cited language to remove the Examiners’s concern.

Regarding the §102(b) rejection of claims 1-26, the Office Action contends that Gish discloses all of the claim limitations recited in the subject claims. Applicants respectfully assert that Gish fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations in claims 1-26, for at least the reasons presented below.

It is well-established law that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants assert that the rejection based on Gish does not meet this basic legal requirement, as will be explained below.

While Applicants believe that the claims, prior to this response, are patentably distinguishable over Gish, Applicants have nonetheless amended independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 26 to further define the invention in a sincere effort to expedite the application through to issuance.

Thus, the claimed invention, as recited for example in amended independent claim 1, provides a method for use in a client/server system of reducing interactions between a client and server in association with an application being accessed by the client at the server. The method comprises the steps of: configuring the server to store a model associated with the application and to execute view-generating and controller logic associated with the application; and configuring the client to store at least a subset of the model associated with the application and to execute at least a subset of the view-generating and controller logic associated with the application, wherein one or

more portions of the application are performed at the client without the client having to interact with the server, and further wherein the client and the server both locally execute the respective model and view-generating and controller logic associated therewith. The underlined language represents the added claim language. Independent claims 13, 25 and 26 recite similar limitations and have been amended in a similar manner.

Applicants maintain and incorporate the arguments presented in their previous response dated October 24, 2005. However, since the Examiner raised concern that it was not clear that the client and the server both locally execute the respective model and view-generating and controller logic associated therewith, Applicants have expressed such in the amended independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 26, as well as the claims which depend therefrom, are patentable over Gish and therefore allowable. Such dependent claims also recite patentable subject matter in their own right. Withdrawal of the §112 and §102 rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



William E. Lewis
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39,274
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-2946

Date: March 28, 2006